

Page 1 of 5

ABCN No.1:	ABCN-W375-00-00049		Rev No.:	0		
Initiating document (DCA, drawing, procedure, etc.):):	BNFL-TWP-SER-00 Design and Constr		Radiation Protec	tion Program for
			DOE Letter 00-RU- RegulatoryUnit (RU Radiation Protectio Construction, Rev.	J) Commer on Program	nts on the Withd	rawn BNFL Inc.
			DOE Letter 00-RU- RegulatoryUnit (RU Amendment Reque Area Dose Rates	J) Disappro	oval of Authoriza	tion Basis
Affected AB docu	iment(s) (SRD, ISMP, etc.):	Design	TWP-SER-003, Rev. I, and BNFL-5193-SF nent Volume II			0

- A. Describe the proposed design or administrative control (procedure, program, plan, or management process) change.
 - 1. Update the Radiation Protection Program (RPP) to include plans and measures appropriate for assuring radiological safety during WTP construction activities.
 - 2. Replace reference to ISMP Sections 2.3 and 3.9.1.2 as implementing standards in SRD Vol. II Safety Criterion 2.0-3 with DOE Implementation Guide G 441.1-2, *Occupational ALARA Program Guide*.
 - 3. Update SRD references to superceded DOE Implementation Guides with the current version of each affected Implementation Guide.
- B. Describe the reason for the proposed change.
 - 1. A revision to the RPP for Design is required because construction activities are outside the current scope of the program. Construction activities may introduce radiological hazards due to the potential presence of radioactive material on the construction site from past or current Hanford Site operations. Additional plans and measures are necessary to minimize potential exposure to radioactive material and to assure worker, public, and environmental protection. As required by 10 CFR 835.101(g)(2), an update of the RPP shall be submitted to DOE prior to the initiation of activities not within the scope of the RPP.
 - 2. The implementing standard is being revised to DOE Implementation Guide G 441.1-2, Occupational ALARA Program Guide, as part of the effort to remove references to the ISMP as implementing standards in the SRD.
 - 3. DOE Letter 00-RU-0507 identified several SRD implementing standards as outdated documents that are associated with superceded federal regulations. The proposed change would replace the outdated references with the current DOE Implementation Guides that are compliant with the existing federal regulation, 10 CFR 835, Occupational Radiation Protection.
- C. List the affected sections of the changed AB document and any other affected AB document, and perform a comparison of the proposed AB change against those sections or documents.
 - 1. The RPP has been completely rewritten to conform to the established Hanford Site format for such programs. As such, all sections of the previous version, *Radiation Protection Program for Design*, Revision 5, are affected by this change.
 - 2. SRD Vol. II Safety Criterion 2.0-3: The implementing standard for this safety criterion will be changed from ISMP Sections 2.3 and 3.9.1.2 to DOE Implementation Guide G 441.1-2, Occupational ALARA Program Guide.
 - 3. The proposed RPP for Design and Construction references the current set of DOE Implementation Guides that

¹ The ABCN document number is obtained from Project Document Control.

² The format, content, and level-of-detail associated with an acceptable safety evaluation is highly dependent on the nature of the proposed revision to the AB. Rather than establishing comprehensive guidance on appropriate evaluation format, content, and level-of-detail, the written evaluation should establish the most fundamental basis that can be applied to evaluating proposed revisions. There is a wide range of acceptable safety evaluation approaches. Also, the appropriate degree of rigor and documentation associated with the safety evaluation should be tailored to the specific AB revision. The Regulatory Unit (in RL/REG-97-13) does not indicate that an explicit and detail case be made and documented showing that the fundamental criteria have been satisfied for all revisions to the authorization basis.



Page 2 of 5

ABCN No.1:	ABCN-W375-00-00049	1	Rev No.:	0	_	
Initiating document (DCA, drawing, procedure, etc.):			BNFL-TWP-SER-00 Design and Constr	•	, Radiation Protection Progran	m for
			RegulatoryUnit (R	U) Comme on Prograr	n D. Gibbs to P. Strawbridge, ents on the Withdrawn BNFL I m (RPP) for Design and	
			RegulatoryUnit (RI	U) Disappr	m D. Gibbs to P. Strawbridge, roval of Authorization Basis -W375-00-00011, Unrestricte	
Affected AB docum	nent(s) (SRD, ISMP, etc.):	Design			ation Protection Program for Rev. 3, Safety Requirements	;

are compliant with 10 CFR 835, Occupational Radiation Protection. However, the following pages from BNFL-5193-SRD-01-02, Revision 3, *Safety Requirements Document Volume II*, reference outdated DOE Implementation Guides:

Page 5-1, Safety Criterion 5.0-1, Implementing Codes and Standards, G-10 CFR 835/B1 Radiation Protection Program.

Page 5-3, Safety Criterion 5.1-3, Implementing Codes and Standards, G-N 5400.9/M1 Sealed Radioactive Source Accountability and Control.

Page 5-3, Safety Criterion 5.1-4, Implementing Codes and Standards, G-N 5400.9/M1 Sealed Radioactive Source Accountability and Control.

Page 5-4, Safety Criterion 5.1-6, Implementing Codes and Standards, G-10 CFR 835/G1 Posting and Labeling for Radiation Control.

Page 5-8, Safety Criterion 5.3-2, Implementing Codes and Standards, G-10 CFR 835/B2 Occupational ALARA Program.

Page 8-1, Safety Criterion 8.0-2, Implementing Codes and Standards, G-10 CFR 835/B2 Occupational ALARA Program.

Page F-1, Appendix F, Section 1.0, reference to G-10 CFR 835/B2 Occupational ALARA Program.

- D. Perform a written evaluation (use separate sheets) that demonstrates that the revision to the AB²:
 - 1. Will continue to comply with all applicable laws and regulations, conform to top-level safety standards, and provide adequate safety.
 - 2. Will continue to conform to the original submittal requirements associated with the authorization basis document(s) affected by the revision.
 - 3. Will not result in inconsistencies with other commitments and descriptions contained in the authorization basis or an authorization agreement.
- E. Describe the implementation schedule for the proposed change. Include reference to all affected documents (AB and otherwise) to ensure an accurate representation of the schedule.

In accordance with 10 CFR 835.101(f), following approval of the RPP by DOE, the affected AB documents will be implemented within 180 days or prior to start of WTP construction activities, whichever occurs earlier.



Page 3 of 5

AB	CN I	No. ¹ :	ABCN-W375-00-00049	1	Rev No.:	0		
Initiating document (DCA, drawing, procedure, etc.):			BNFL-TWP-SER-003, Rev. 6, Radiation Protection Program for Design and Construction					
					RegulatoryUnit (RU)	0428 from D. Gibbs i 0 Comments on the in 1 Program (RPP) for its contraction in the image in	Withdrawn B	
						0507 from D. Gibbs i Disapproval of Autl st, ABAR-W375-00-0	horization Ba	sis
Af	fecte	d AB docur	ment(s) (SRD, ISMP, etc.):	Design	TWP-SER-003, Rev , and BNFL-5193-SRI ent Volume II			
F.	Ans	swer the follo	owing questions to determine if	the prope	osed revision to the AB	requires prior approv	al by the Regi	ılatory
		t (RU).					_	
	1.		evision involve the deletion or n I in the approved SRD?	nodificat	ion of a standard previo	ously identified or	Yes	☐ No
			SRD Vol. II Safety Criterion as implementing standards DOE Implementation Guide Guide.	. These	ISMP sections are be	eing replaced by		
		Explain:	The SRD lists several imple documents associated with change would replace thes Implementation Guides tha 10 CFR 835, Occupational I proposed RPP for Design a	superce e outdat it are co Radiation	eded federal regulation and references with the mpliant with existing an Protection, and con	ons. The proposed ne current DOE federal regulation,		
	2.	Does the re	evision result in a reduction in co	ommitme	ent currently described	in the AB?	Yes	No No
			DOE ImplementationGuide is more responsive to the S replaces; therefore, the lev	RD safe	ty criterion than the	ISMP sections it		
		Explain:	Replacing outdated implem necessary to meet CHG's of Radiation Protection Progra Radiation Protection. The the existing federal regulation commitment.	ommitm am comp propose	ent to develop and ir bliant with 10 CFR 83 d change will ensure	mplement a 5, Occupational compliance with		
	3.		evision result in a reduction in to nt process described in the AB?		veness of any procedur	re, program, plan, or	Yes	No No
		J	G 441.1-2 is more responsi referenced ISMP sections it ALARA design program is n	ve to the replace	s; therefore, the effe			
		Explain:	Replacing superceded refer Implementation Guide refe federal regulation, 10 CFR enhancing the effectivenes	rences e 835, Occ	ensures compliance w cupational Radiation	vith the existing Protection, while		
							<u>.</u>	

If all the answers to questions F1-F3 are no, then the AB change can be made without prior RU approval. If the answer to question F1 is yes, then follow the directions in item G and attach to this ABCN. If the answer to question F2 or F3 is yes, then follow the directions in item H and attach to this ABCN.



Page 4 of 5

AB	CN No. ¹ :	ABCN-W375-00-00049)	Rev No.:	0		
Initiating document (DCA, drawing, procedure, etc.):			, etc.):	BNFL-TWP-SER-003, Rev. 6, Radiation Protection Program for Design and Construction			
				RegulatoryUnit (RI	-0428 from D. Gibbs to P. Strawbridge, U) Comments on the Withdrawn BNFL Inc. on Program (RPP) for Design and . 4		
				RegulatoryUnit (Rl	-0507 from D. Gibbs to P. Strawbridge, U) Disapproval of Authorization Basis est, ABAR-W375-00-00011, Unrestricted		
Aff	ected AB docur	nent(s) (SRD, ISMP, etc.):	Design		ev. 5, Radiation Protection Program for RD-01-02, Rev. 3, Safety Requirements		
G.	If the revision in	nvolves the deletion or modific	ation of a	standard previously i	identified in the approved SRD, provide a		
o.	certification tha		et of stan	dards that continues to	o provide adequate safety, comply with all		
H.	. If the revision results in a reduction in commitment or reduction in effectiveness currently described in the AB justify the changes and demonstrate that the proposed change is safe. Consider a line-by-line comparison justification or, alternatively, a "first principles" justification (consult ES&H).						
lette					RU approval is required, prepare a formal cover constitutes a request to amend the		
	If a "decision to deviate" from the AB will be used while this ABCN is pending, the Preparer and the Reviewer must sign below before entering the deviation option (see K70P551 for details on deviating from the AB).						
Atta	achments:						
 Copies of the AB document(s) or appropriate excerpt showing the proposed revision(s). Written evaluation from D, above. The certification from G, above, if applicable. The justification from H, above, if applicable. 							
Prej	parer ³ :				Date:		
Rev	viewer ³ :				Date:		
Maı	nager, ES&H:				Date:		
Maı	nager, QA:				Date:		
Cha	ir, PSC:				Date:		
	neral Manager, P-WTP:				Date:		
If a	If a Decision to Deviate (DTD) from the AB has been initiated, enter the DTD and Deficiency Report numbers here:						
AB	ABCN incorporated in revision of						

 $^{^{\}rm 3}$ The Preparer and Reviewer must have received Authorization Basis maintenance training.



Page 5 of 5

ABCN No.¹:	ABCN-W375-00-00049)	Rev No.:	0		
Initiating document (DCA, drawing, procedure, etc.):		BNFL-TWP-SER-003, Rev. 6, Radiation Protection Program for Design and Construction				
			DOE Letter 00-RU- RegulatoryUnit (RU Radiation Protection Construction, Rev.	J) Commer on Program	nts on the Withdra	wn BNFL Inc.
			DOE Letter 00-RU- RegulatoryUnit (RU Amendment Reque Area Dose Rates	J) Disappro	oval of Authorization	on Basis
Design		L-TWP-SER-003, Rev. 5, Radiation Protection Program for gn, and BNFL-5193-SRD-01-02, Rev. 3, Safety Requirements ument Volume II				
ADON 1 11						
ABCN closed by:						
			Signature	9		Date